UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The People's War Against Crime

By Thomas E. Dewey

A New Plan to End War - *A. Powell Davies*

The Neutrality Question - *Salmon O. Levinson*

Academic Freedom - - - *Jerome Davis*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXXIII NUMBER 10

Chicago, July 17, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES F. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 147

ARTICLES—
The People's War Against Crime—THOMAS E. DEWEY 150
A New Plan to End War—A. POWELL DAVIES 152
The Neutrality Question—SALMON O. LEVINSON 155
Academic Freedom—JEROME DAVIS 156

POETRY—
I Felt the Presence of God—GERTRUDE KNOPF BRADFORD 149
Idols—SHELDON SHEPARD 151
Jungle Blood—LLOYD FRANK MERRELL 155
Half a Loaf. . .—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 159

THE STUDY TABLE—
A German Rebel—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 157
The Method of Experience—JAMES LUTHER ADAMS 158
Meaningful Worship—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 159

CORRESPONDENCE—
Protest—A. G. 160
Henry Frick, Not Henry Flagler—OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD. 160
A Compensationist in This Modern Age—PAUL TURNER 160

THE FIELD—
The New Neutrality Bill— I—*The Christian Century* 146
II—*Zion's Herald* 146
Kagawa Visits Gandhi 160

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The New Neutrality Bill

I

By a strict party vote the foreign affairs committee of the House of Representatives reported a new neutrality bill to that body last week. The bill, which embodies the recommendations of the administration as sent to Congress by Secretary Hull, will bear the name of the chairman of the committee, Congressman Sol Bloom of New York. The principal change from legislation now in force would be the dropping of the embargo against sales of primary munitions to belligerents and the restoration of a system of cash-and-carry to cover sales of materials of all kinds in time of war. The President would also be given authority to keep American citizens from traveling in war zones and on the ships of belligerents. Another section of the proposed law would make all collections for medical or other aid for any nation involved in war subject to presidential approval. It seems likely that the Bloom Bill will pass the lower house, although the Republicans may delay its passage somewhat longer than the administration anticipates. But the real fight will come in the Senate, where more than twenty senators are reported to have pledged themselves to a bitter-end struggle. Under Senate rules, twenty unyielding senators could easily stave off a vote for months. By this time the nation at large, as well as Congress, must understand that the essential purpose of the Bloom Bill is to substitute for the general arms embargo a system under which Great Britain and France could be sure of using the United States as a munitions base in case of another European war. That it would also work to the advantage of Japan in a Far Eastern war is a minor factor as yet not so widely appreciated. We fear the prospect held out by the Bloom Bill. We are willing to accept the cash-and-carry principle as perhaps the best available method for dealing with the problem of general exports in time of war. But if war comes, the result of placing the munitions business under this same principle will simply be the building up of a vast armament business in this country, with the unhealthy industrial expansion incident thereto. After the nation's economic life becomes dependent on the fortunes of such a boom, the gate to the road to war is flung wide open. It is to be hoped that Senate resolution to fight this Bloom Bill to a finish will not waver, no matter what the heat in Washington.

The Christian Century.

II

There is a touch of masterful genius in the strangely named "neutrality" proposals of Secretary of State Hull, embodied in the Bloom Bill presented to Congress. Very evidently, if we want to get into a European war, Mr.

(*Continued on page* 160)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIII MONDAY, JULY 17, 1939 No. 10

THE SOUL

We cannot describe the natural history of the soul, but we know that it is divine. I cannot tell if these wonderful qualities which house today in this mortal frame shall ever re-assemble in equal activity in a similar frame, or whether they have before had a natural history like that of this body you see before you. But this one thing I know, that these qualities did not now begin to exist, cannot be sick with my sickness, nor buried in any grave; but that they circulate through the universe. Before the world was, they were. Nothing can bar them out, or shut them in, but they penetrate the ocean and land, space and time, form an essence and hold the key to universal nature. I draw from this: faith, courage and hope. All things are known to the soul. It is not to be surprised by any communication. Nothing can be greater than it. Let those fear and those fawn who will. The soul is in her native realm, and it is wider than space, older than time, wide as hope, rich as love. Pusillanimity and fear she refuses with a beautiful scorn. They are not for her who puts on her coronation robes and goes out through universal love to universal power.

—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

THE DRAMA OF WAR AND PEACE

What a drama is now being enacted on the world's great stage! What forces are in conflict for war or peace! On the one hand, the powers are arming feverishly for war, and more and more solidifying those alliances which constitute the line-up for the impending battle. What is forming before our eyes is a new balance of power, which would seem to be as surely fated to topple into war as the old balance of power in 1913-14. On the other hand, however, are forces of which 1913-14 knew nothing whatsoever. These are the forces making for peace. When in all history were men ever putting forth such gigantic efforts, at any cost of humiliation and defeat, to keep the peace? In September last, it was Neville Chamberlain struggling desperately in a last hour to "preserve peace in our time." In April, it was President Roosevelt, in peril of all his prestige, pleading with Hitler and Mussolini to listen to reason. Last month it was the Pope of Rome placing the stupendous appeasement powers of the Mother Church at the disposal of the contending nations of the world. We must believe, as we watch these peace efforts, that the conscience of mankind is at work upon this problem. Behind Premier and President and Pope is the prayerful resolve of the peoples not to be sacrificed to bleeding Mars. Activities of this kind do not come out of nothing. Even popes do not act without the support of their constituents. And in Germany and Italy, as well as in France and England, there must be a public will to peace. Can that will now assert itself before the forces of destruction break loose from all control? Our own feeling is that the situation is by no means discouraging. As judged by every precedent of the past, war seems inevitable. But war has been inevitable now for months, even years—and yet it does not come! We insist that there are new and saving forces at work in the world which have never been at work before. Why should we not do at last what has never been done before? *Conquer war!*

THE ADMINISTRATION'S NEUTRALITY POLICY

The new neutrality law, pressed by Mr. Roosevelt as "must" legislation, is the most dangerous proposal of foreign policy that this nation has seen since Woodrow Wilson and the World War. It enacts everything that got us into the last war and will get us into the next war. Fortunately, the House has removed most of its worst features, and it looks as though the Senate would dispose of it altogether. But let the issue be stated that we may understand! It inheres in the matter of handing over to the President unreserved power to name aggressors in foreign wars; to declare or not declare embargoes at his own discretion, in general to take action on his own initiative which will make America not a neutral but a belligerent. When the original neutrality law of 1935 was revised in 1937, enlarging the power of the President to favor one side or the other in an international conflict of arms, the peril of the action was admirably stated by Mr. John Bassett Moore, who is described by Professor Beard, in his new history, *America in Mid-Passage,* as "the greatest American authority on international law and diplomacy." Said Mr. Moore:

> No one who wished unlimited power to make war could ask for more than the authority, in his own discretion, to impose and revoke, and to modify and adjust, embargoes on our foreign commerce. . . . To commit to the executive the power in his discretion to adopt and prosecute measures that naturally lead to war, is virtually to transfer to him the power to make war, so that the formal declaration by Congress of the existence of a state of war would be an essentially perfunctory act.

The new neutrality bill, as submitted by the administration, goes far beyond anything contemplated by the

1937 law. It accomplishes in effect the utterly unconstitutional thing of transferring the warmaking power to the President. Anything more dangerous than this, more completely subversive of the democratic principle, we cannot imagine. It is the people who should decide this war and peace business—hence we are in favor of the Ludlow Amendment. In the matter of official action, it is the Congress and not the President who should exercise the war power—hence we would make the present neutrality law tighter rather than looser. That Mr. Roosevelt wants this power is the one best reason why he should not have it. And the same applies to his successors!

JAPAN AND THE WESTERN POWERS

If the situation were not so terrible in its potentialities of war, it would be highly amusing to watch what Japan is doing to the western concessionaires in China. What Japan is proposing to do, of course, is to drive Britain, France, Holland, and the United States out of Asia; and she is beginning the process of ousting, naturally enough, in China, and very particularly with Britain in China. The outrage of Britain is nothing short of apoplectic. It is exhilarating to note in London that the representatives of the Labor Party in the House of Commons are just as much outraged by Japan's performances at Tientsin and elsewhere as the Tories—and the Liberals, in turn, as much excited as the Laborites. When it comes to the Empire, you bet your boots, Britains are every whit as totalitarian as the Nazis themselves. But to return to Asia! What is Britain doing in China, anyhow? What right has she to be there? What sanction can Britain appeal to in defense of her present holdings in the East except the very one which Japan is now herself exercising in her own interest? Let the truth be told! Britain took over China, or as much of it as she wanted, in the last century, by precisely the same method of appropriation by force of arms as Japan is now using in this present century. If we would match the horrors of Japanese bombings today, we have them in the horrors of England's indescribable Opium War yesterday. It is the same miserable business of the wolf attacking and devouring the sheep. The English wolf—like the French wolf, etc.—has been so long in the sheepfold, that he has actually come to think it belongs to him. He does not like this new, gaunt, hungry wolf from Nippon, who now proposes to take over the spoil. And he actually talks about rights—as though time sanctified piracy and plunder. It is to laugh! We offer no apologies for Japan. We weep with the rest of mankind over what is now going on in China. But our tears, if you please, fall for the Chinese people. There is not so much as a trickle from our eyes for the British concessionaires.

LET LABOR GIVE THOUGHT!

In the June 21st issue of the *Christian Century* there appears a disquieting article on the Wisconsin situation following upon the defeat of Governor La Follette in the last election. The anti-Progressive landslide "called a halt to the march of social and political reforms begun by the [La Follette] dynasty forty-odd years ago," wrecked "the Progressive monuments that made of Wisconsin a shining example for other states," and set back the cause of labor a generation. Nothing is more tragic than the way the new Heil administration in Wisconsin is sweeping away labor's rights and privileges, and shackling the working man anew. In seeking an explanation of this great political disaster, the author of this article, an experienced journalist, traces it "in good part" to the "resentment by farmers over grievances, imaginary or real, against the activities of organized labor with its new legal sanctions." This resentment, he points out, extends to other midwest and western states—as witness the wiping out of the Non-Partisan League in Minnesota!—"and has, for the time at least, effectively smothered any hopes held by advocates of a national liberal third party." Labor, in other words, by its uses of victory in these recent days, is alienating its own best friends. The feud between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. for example, reaching as it does from headquarters in Washington to little shops and stores in crossroad villages, is working awful havoc. The sit-down strikes, temporarily effective, were nonetheless, from the standpoint of *tactics* in a hard struggle, suicidal in a society dominated by the public opinion of a middle class certain to be frightened and alienated by resort to such a weapon. At the New York World's Fair, the sheer greed of organized labor, the old-line craft unions, has created a scandal of the first magnitude. It is enough to make the angels weep thus to see labor betrayed by itself. We can think of no greater tragedy than to have the debâcle of 1938 in Wisconsin extended to the whole nation in 1940, unless it be the concomitant tragedy of such debâcle being attributed, as in the case of Wisconsin, to "the activities of organized labor with its new legal sanctions."

HOW NOT TO DO THINGS

The ending of the W. P. A. Federal Theatre Project is a calamity, not only from the standpoint of the actors and stagehands now abandoned, even though they constitute only a few thousand among the millions of unemployed, but also from the standpoint of the undertaking itself. Here was something new in the history of America—the entrance of the government into the field of art as well as of agriculture and industry. Out of this venture might well have sprung a National Theatre such as has long glorified France and other European countries. What a pity it was not

continued! But let not the blame for this tragedy be placed on Congress. Let it rest where it belongs—on the heads of the W. P. A. and of the directors of the Project. These have brought down upon themselves the wreckage under which they now lie buried. Look at the situation! Here, in the beginning, was a new project, and something therefore bound in the nature of the case to stir up criticism and opposition. The public, to which the project had to make its appeal for sympathy and support, was in a peculiar state of mind—sensitive, irritable, frightened, as the result of years of depression and disaster. If anything was absolutely required in this situation it was tact, a delicate approach, a flank movement rather than a frontal attack. The Theatre Project, if wisely directed, would have cultivated the spirit of frolic and merriment, as it did once at least with the "Swing Mikado." It would have turned to poetry and beauty, as it did once again with Eliot's "Murder in the Cathedral." It would have undertaken a systematic series of great revivals, and thus given the nation for the first time a classical stage. But all the emphasis was the other way. At the very start, the Theatre Project headed straight for the dangerous field of political and social satire. It dramatized current events in the spirit of radicalism; it put on a "Living Newspaper" to pour farcical contempt upon enemies of the administration; it became bitterly partisan on highly controversial issues, such as labor and capital; in general, it ran wild. With the result that it played right into the hands of the anti-red crowd, gave precious ammunition to opponents of the New Deal, and now has smashed up, with no resurrection possible for a generation! If ever there was a perfect example of how not to do things, this was it. When, O when, shall we liberals learn a little common sense?

THE GIFT OF PROPHECY

The experiments of Professor Rhine, of Duke University, in his investigations of clairvoyance and telepathy, have become familiar through his book, *New Frontiers of the Mind.* Clairvoyance, as we know, is apprehension of objects, symbols, or events without ordinary sense perception—seeing things without the use of the eyes. Telepathy is apprehension of ideas or thoughts without ordinary sense communication—"mind reading," as it is commonly called. Both are phases of a general process which Professor Rhine terms "extra-sensory perception." In his experiments, as told in detail in his book, Professor Rhine has secured results which seem quite to exclude the element of chance. Thus, in handling a pack of 25 cards containing five symbols on five cards each, he has found subjects who can identify the cards unseen a proportion of times largely in excess of the chance average of one in five. One subject, in running through 5,000 cards, named correctly an average of ten out of twenty-five, which is just twice the average of chance. The same thing happened with telepathy! Subjects challenged to read not cards face down on the table but the ideas of these cards as projected in the mind, made scores as high as 8, 8.7, and even 13.6 per 25. Now, in an article some little time ago in the *Journal of Parapsychology,* Professor Rhine announces a new series of experiments in "prophecy," or clairvoyance practiced not through space but through time. In his previous tests, the subject was asked to guess cards as laid on a table, or shuffled in a pack. In this latest series, the subject was asked to guess *beforehand* what order the cards would be placed on the table or shuffled in the pack. In more than 100,000 separate trials, the score of the prophets was so favorable that "it is computed possible by chance only once in about 400,000 repetitions of the experiment." What all this means we do not know. The idea of fraud is preposterous. The element of luck, or chance, has been eliminated. Professor Rhine suspects that we are facing "a fundamental readjustment of our view of mind and its relation to the world of the senses." The only alternative would seem to be a complete upset in the law of probabilities. But—is this probable?

I Felt the Presence of God

From the hidden Buddhist monastery in Tibet came the sound of Temple Bells, and
I felt the presence of God.

From the mighty Cathedral came the glorious strains of the "Ave Maria," and
I felt the presence of God.

From the aged stone-walled Synagogue came the desolate music of the Kol Nidrei, and
I felt the presence of God.

From under the glittering Ikons came the strange intoning of a Slavic voice, and
I felt the presence of God.

From the lonely figure on the Minaret came the eternal chant of Allah, and
I felt the presence of God.

From the little village Church came simple, solemn voices singing "Rock of Ages," and
I felt the presence of God.

GERTRUDE KNOPF BRADFORD.

The People's War Against Crime*

THOMAS E. DEWEY

In your citation tonight you call attention to the renewed confidence of our people in their institutions and in the power of government under law to protect itself from enemies within. I should like to accept the Newman Award, not personally but as a tribute to the thousands of citizens who made that renewed confidence possible by their faith and by their courage.

I refer to thousands of grand jurors, petty jurors, businessmen, and workers who dared to stand up and fight. They fought against deadlier enemies from within than our society had ever before known.

We long ago left behind us the day when the burglar or highwayman was a serious problem in the lives of our people. We learned how to deal with the common criminal. But, as the progress of an orderly society brought mastery of that problem, a new and more serious threat developed. Crime became organized in a more subtle and far more dangerous form. Huge combinations of crime came into being. They were under the control of small groups of powerful and dangerous men. They regarded every aspect of society, legal and illegal, as their legitimate prey. The racket became a super-government outside the law.

With the rise of large rackets in city after city, and state after state, crime itself became big business. Whole communities knew it, feared it, and kept silent. Too often, as racketeering grew and operated, the eye of the law itself seemed to be blind. Often people of influence were closely involved. No longer could crime take the ordinary business risk of the old-fashioned single marauder. So crime went into politics. The racketeer became a power in politics in America, and with political power came immunity. Local overlords dictated the selection of men for public office. Unfit, even dangerous, men who thus acquired high office carried with them into positions of public trust the morals of their sponsors and bosses.

Worse than this, there came into people's lives a distrust of their political system, a distrust of the law itself, a cynical disregard of the true function of politics. Whole communities felt helpless before a new and menacing power over which they seemed to have no control.

The relationship between crime and politics was winked at in high places. The support of such combinations of political power was accepted by those in high places and in return they gave to these combinations recognition, reward, and still more power.

Against these conditions twenty-three grand jurors started a fight in New York more than four years ago. Courageous newspapers demanded action. Courageous grand jurors undertook to give it. They called in public officials who recognized the problem. But they had no solution. Witnesses were called from all walks of life but they were silent and afraid.

It was not long before the foreman of that grand jury and some of its members began getting messages. They were told it was not good business to put their noses in other people's business. They were told it was not healthy. But they had the courage to carry on. After four months of effort they were unable to penetrate the blank wall of silence and fear. They demanded the intervention of the State. After a long battle, they won a special investigation and other grand jurors took up the work.

Finally, private citizens, too, acquired courage and faith. The racket victims themselves began to believe that the community, through its grand jurors, meant business.

Confidence came back again to people in all walks of life. For example, there was a chambermaid in a leading New York hotel. On trial was probably the most vicious gangster who ever dominated the underworld. His co-defendants were eight gunmen and thugs. His defense was that he did not even know these men, his own henchmen, and that he had never seen any of them in his life. Into the tense atmosphere of that crowded courtroom came Mary Brown. That is the name we called her by because it was not her name. Calmly she told how she had seen one after another of the gang go into the room of the boss for long conferences day after day. She well knew the character of the men on trial. Yet she walked down from that witness stand and put her hand on the shoulder of each one of them. The whole defense collapsed. The courage of Mary Brown and others like her did the job.

And so it was with trial jurors. In every racket trial in my experience there has been fear in the minds of jurors, and the courage to overcome it. Such was their fear, that in every trial members of the jury have asked for bodyguards when they left the courthouse at the end of the case. But such was their courage that by their verdict they did their duty to themselves and their neighbors.

Thousands of men and women left their daily tasks to do their part and carry on the fight. It was their courage which won the fight. In so doing they proved their faith in their own institutions. They proved that society's problem could be solved without new laws, without new powers, and in the best traditions of a free Republic.

Today the extermination of organized crime is gradually progressing from city to city. Its sponsors are being exposed and driven from power. The people have learned they need no longer tolerate the furtive alliance between the upper and the underworld. In high places it has been learned that clean government can also be good politics. It will take years to finish the job but the good news of today is this—America is cleaning its own house.

So in your citation for the Newman Award I see recognition, not of an individual but of thousands of individuals who demonstrated confidence in their institutions and the will to make them work. As private citizens, those thousands of men and women earned your award. For they have

*An address by the District Attorney of New York on the occasion of his receiving the Newman Award at the Newman Foundation, University of Illinois.

shown again that when the American people see their problems, they themselves, out of their own strength, demand and procure a solution.

My own experience has convinced me that in the long run the people get what they want from their government. Corrupt power may delay the result. But it only serves finally to make the change more decisive.

I have not devoted eight years of my life to the administration of justice because I take pleasure in prosecuting and convicting. Rather I think of them as eight years spent in one of the laboratories which test the qualities of government and its ability to make right those things that are wrong.

In that laboratory we learn that punishment is not a cure. It is only half of the job. It is vital that we have laws to prevent man from injuring his neighbor—and that we make these laws work. But no nation was ever made good or strong by laws alone. The pretended strength of government is never a substitute for the real strength of the individual. It has been shown in many countries that excessive reliance upon government has the effect of weakening the individual. The tower of a high building is no firmer than the weakest part of its foundations. Similarly, society cannot endure if government is built on a mass of weakened individuals.

The real prevention for crime against society is not to be found in legal devices, but only in the gradual restoration of man's ideas of what is really worthwhile.

Last week a seven-year-old boy was called by one of my assistants as a witness for the People in a criminal case. When the judge asked him whether he knew what an oath meant, he said "No." Then the judge asked, "Do you know what it means to tell the truth?" and the child's eyes lit up and he said, "Yes, sir." "What would happen if you didn't tell the truth?" the judge asked, and the boy answered, "Oh, God would punish me."

Instinctively, our people turn to the teachings of religion as the source of fundamental truths. In childhood, the conception of such truths is clear and untarnished by worldly cynicism.

Many men, particularly as they become older, grow cynical and skeptical of any values except those they can see and enjoy. They come to believe that their own life is an end in itself. Consequently, they strive to pack within it the maximum of material gains.

Out of such worldliness are born the worst crimes—the betrayals of trust, the reckless striving for money and for power. And toward such crimes we find indifference—an indifference which always prevails among those who share the same motives and hold the same estimate of life.

We live today in a changing world, in many parts of which is preached a new, but really age-old, paganism. Some would go back to the dark ages. They exalt the state as the supreme source of all authority. Duty to the state is taught as a substitute for duty to God. They would drown the voice of conscience with the rattle of drums and would substitute for moral law the dictates of expediency. False prophets teach that the individual and his freedom must be suppressed for the glory of the state. They display that same blunted moral sense toward crimes against whole peoples that some men display toward individual wrongdoing.

"If the Church falls sick," said Cardinal Newman, "the world shall utter a wail for its own sake." The danger is never to religion. The danger is to those who abandon religion. For where material values are set above spiritual values, religion ceases to be vital. And, where religion is no longer vital, pagan philosophies move in. The need of the world today is for vigorous spiritual strength, flowing from divine guidance.

The day is at hand when all men must unite and fight invasion by pagan ideals. Fortunately, in all faiths, leaders are stepping forward to carry on this fight. Naturally, there are differences of creed. In the right of expression of these and other differences between free men lies the very essence of their freedom.

A real unity of purpose will emphasize the importance of man as an individual, obedient to the God he worships in his own way, and not as a cog in a materialistic society. Our common belief is that there are values other than material ones and objectives more noble than any that can be fashioned by man. These beliefs need more general acceptance in modern life. They need to become a more practical influence on the conduct of men. Thereby, as I see it, we can wage successfully the other half of our battle for a clean and healthful society.

The world today is not too militant. It is militant in the wrong way and for the wrong purposes. We need—and desperately need—a spiritual militancy.

In bronze letters at the entrance of the Newman Foundation are these words from George Washington's Farewell Address: "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles." In those words we may well find the beacon of wisdom for the America of today. We shall reject false gods of material philosophies. With unity of purpose we shall carry forward the religious ideals without which no country can remain free. Adhering to our own traditions, we shall preserve them. When we have cleaned our own house, we shall keep it clean.

Idols

Before the altar dimly lit,
In solemn hush the people sit;
The music soothes their troubled hearts
While parsons read their pious parts.

The people then go on their way,
Their duty done this holy day;
They think that they have brought to him
Their worship in the temple dim.

They feel their Christian duty done,
And now to other interests run;
For here they spent the righteous zeal
That might have served the common weal.

SHELDON SHEPARD

A New Plan to End War

A. POWELL DAVIES*

In the autumn of last year, the world narrowly escaped a catastrophe from which Western civilization might never have recovered. We who live in the United States hoped at that time that if war came we would be able to keep out of it; yet the very intensity of our interest was evidence of the enormous odds against such a hope lasting very long. In addition, we discovered then, and have become even more certain since, that no great war could take place which would not affect our national destiny as well as the destiny of other nations, whether we fought in it or not. In short, the threat of war anywhere on a calamitous scale is a threat to every nation in the world and to every man and woman individually. Irrespective of whether we believe in isolation or in collective security, in neutrality or in some kind of participation, the menace of war remains almost limitless, the consequences of war incalculable. Therefore, more than anything else whatever, responsible citizens of all nations urgently desire to end the threat of general war.

If we believe that Western civilization can endure as it stands and that it should endure, we desire to prevent general war in order to save Western civilization. If, however, we believe that we are moving towards a world civilization which will supersede Western civilization, we desire to make the transition without an intervening period of disaster.

And if we are wise enough, if our good will is forthright enough, if our moral courage can meet the challenge, we are indeed at the present moment in a position to prevent war with certainty. In addition, we are in a position to promote prosperity—such prosperity as the world has not seen for a long time and which in itself would be no mean support to an affirmative and progressive peace. And finally, we are in a position to begin to build a world civilization in which none of the greater values of Western civilization would be lost.

All this has not happened merely because of the book written by Clarence Streit; what Mr. Streit proposes in his splendid book has been shaping in the minds of many idealists for a long time. But Mr. Streit puts it forth as a definite plan, practically worked out. The name of his book is *Union Now* and it proposes the immediate federal union of ten democracies and contemplates the inclusion of all other nations which can be brought to adhere to a constitution based on the American Constitution's "Bill of Rights."

Now the federal union of ten democracies is, if you take it seriously, a breath-taking proposal. Probably you refuse to take it seriously. You say, "Splendid, of course, but entirely visionary. It cannot be done." Well, if you feel like that about it, say what you feel and get it out of your system. Then sit down and study the plan. You may be surprised at the result. Perhaps it would take a little persuasion even to get you to study the plan. Very well! Let me try to persuade you.

Clarence Streit is *not* a visionary; he is a hard-working journalist, a foreign correspondent of the New York *Times*. He has every reason to be as "hard-boiled" as anyone in this country. In fact, greater reason, for he has witnessed most of the recent "raw deals" of international diplomacy and observed with his eyes wide open one failure of idealism after another. He does not write as a visionary; he writes as one who deals in practical facts and reasonable projects. As to what outstanding men of affairs think of his book, let us notice that Lionel Curtis, one of the founders of the union of South Africa completely endorses it; Manley Hudson, Judge of the World Court, gives it enthusiastic praise. Wickham Steed, former editor of the London *Times*, tells Mr. Streit his proposals are such that he, Mr. Steed, will go all the way with them. Dr. Bruce Hopper, Associate Professor of Government in Harvard University, gives his approval. And the chorus of praise is still growing. There will be opposition, too, before long, opposition from all whose special interests would be injured by the plan; and opposition—inevitably—from all "jingoes" everywhere. But the plan itself is definitely workable, as presently I hope to some extent to show.

Before doing so, however, let me say one or two further things likely to dispel prejudice. Anyone who says a thing cannot be done in the modern world is likely to have to eat his words. Amazing things have already been done; who would have believed six or seven years ago that the present totalitarian powers could have become what they have become? Who would have believed that such changes within those nations could have taken place, or that the international consequences of such changes could have become what they are? With an inferior faith, accomplishments of incredible vigor have occurred where least of all we would have supposed they could occur. Is nothing amazing ever to be possible to the democracies?

It may be said by some that initial prejudice against a plan for the federal union of the democracies would prevent its consideration. I wonder! If the plan receives fair presentation, I do not believe there exists a prejudice strong enough to defeat it. After presenting it briefly to about twenty young high school students, I deliberately stimulated their nationalistic feeling before asking them to raise their hands if they were in favor of the plan. Unanimously, they were. It seemed to them utter nonsense that nationalism should stand in its way. Of course, these were young people of our own Church fellowship who might be regarded as a special case, but I would definitely undertake to get an overwhelming majority of high school students anywhere to express themselves in favor of this plan.

Now let us look at the plan itself. Perhaps it is best to begin by noticing what Mr. Streit points out as an important historical fact, i. e., that wherever alliances and leagues have been tried, they have always failed after a short time. Isolation also has never remained isolation. But wherever union has been tried, it has succeeded, provided that those who tried it were of the democratic faith. The most important instance of which is the United States, of course. But this is by no means a solitary instance. The French and the English of Canada have succeeded; the French, Italians, and Germans of Switzerland have succeeded; the Dutch and English of South Africa have succeeded.

In contrast to these successes, we notice the fail-

*Minister of the Community Church, Summit, New Jersey.

ures of all leagues, alliances, isolationisms and balances of power. The League of Nations has failed. It failed because it remained a League of Nations, instead of being a true community of peoples. It remained a collection of nationalisms, competing and maneuvering, and it could become nothing better, simply because it was a league and not an organic union. As for balances of power, they always overbalance, one way or the other. War is sometimes delayed by them, but never prevented. Meanwhile, there is a moral state of warfare all the time.

As for isolationism, we are sufficiently familiar with the fragile basis of its hopes. If we do not believe in accepting war for any cause whatever, perhaps isolationism, so-called, is the last stand which can be made. But it does not hold much immediate hope, for even in the unlikely event that isolation endures, the *effects* of war cannot be held outside our national boundaries. In addition to these considerations, there is the positive challenge to all of us to do something to prevent war throughout the whole world and to build a constructive peace. It is clear, I think, that only some kind of *union* can offer any hope of firm peace, likely to endure. Whatever may be our attitude to war if it comes—and I, for one, am still in favor of keeping the United States out of war—this way of union is the only immediately constructive way of producing affirmative peace.

But would such a union actually produce such a peace? If so, how? In the first place, it would produce peace because no nation or combination of nations could possibly hope to overthrow such a union; to attack it at all, once it was formed, would be suicidal. Not only would its armed might be formidable beyond all possibility of conquest, but its control of the economic necessities of war would be practically complete. Acting as a single organic unit, such a commonwealth could obviously withstand any attack whatever and subdue the attacker at its convenience. The evidence for this is presented in full by Mr. Streit, and tabulated; but as to that, I do not think any informed person doubts it. Therefore, in a sense that never could apply to a defensive "league" with all its uncertainties, a union of democracies could put aggression by other powers out of the question.

In the second place, no cause for war could exist —no cause which could rally the people of whole nations. For any nation which desired access to raw materials, or free opportunity in the world markets, or a larger place in world industry could get all these things for its citizens simply by joining the commonwealth. There would be no valid excuse for staying outside! However, we are anticipating a little. Let us go into further detail as to the plan itself. The proposal is that the following ten democracies, the American Union, the Nations of the British Commonwealth, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland, unite to form a common government for their people—

> . . . a government based on the principle that the state is made for men, not man for the state, and organized on the broad lines of the American Constitution. . . . Such a union would have a common citizenship, defense force, customs, money and communications system. It would guarantee to each democracy the right to govern its home affairs in its own tongue according to its own customs. It would leave the door open to all other democracies that would guarantee their citizens the Union's minimum Bill of Rights.

Thus, all local patriotism could be preserved just as it is in the several states of the American Union. But the federal government would control the affairs of the union as a whole.

Such a union could reduce its armaments and still be safe; it could save its taxpayers billions of dollars in needless taxes. It would make trade possible on such a scale that the whole world would move towards prosperity. At the same time, and more important, it would bring a great wave of idealism back to earth and the brotherhood of man would begin to have meaning. For the arguments on the economic side, I must refer you to the book; to me, they are entirely persuasive. As to currency, it is a fact at this very moment that the democracies have been compelled to set up schemes for keeping their currencies on a single stable basis of relationship to each other. A single currency is only one step farther and a sound one. It should be remembered that financial management would be on much the same basis as prevails in the states of the American Union. There would not be a general assumption of previously national or local debts or anything whatever of that sort—just a single currency, tremendously promoting confidence as a basis for world trade.

Suppose it be agreed that, on the whole, this would be a good thing; that in general the good to be gained would be so great that if only it were a possible project, it would be desired,—then comes the question, is it a possible project?

Are the rivalries between the democracies themselves too intense? Part of the answer to this question is in the forgotten fact that no war has occurred between any of these democracies for over a hundred years. Not one of them at the present time fears war from any other of them. Already, they are in a situation where greater trade between them is what they all need for the advantage of each. Furthermore, they believe in international law. Together, they govern nearly half of mankind. Half of the world is in their control. Is there very much to keep them apart?

When we come to the situation as it applies in the United States, we find at the outset, as has been pointed out several times lately, that the people of the United States give their allegiance, not to a piece of territory or to a "country," but to a Constitution. The oath of a citizen is one to defend not the territory, but the Constitution. If Americans had to choose between staying where they are and losing the Constitution and what it stands for, and pioneering in new places and taking the Constitution and American liberty with them, who can doubt that the second would be the majority choice? Americanism is not so much geographical as a way of life. The extension of the principles of the Constitution therefore cannot possibly do violence to whatever is deepest in American patriotism. Indeed, the present situation of the democracies is so amazingly similar to that of the thirteen states which formed the American Union, that Mr. Streit bases a great deal of his hopefulness on it. Let us remember that here in America, before union came about, a league was tried—a "League of Friendship"—and it failed so dismally that a convention was called to see what could be done about it. When it was proposed at that time that a federal union be instituted, such as afterwards came to exist, the proposal was laughed to scorn!

Unfortunately, we have forgotten how tremendously difficult, how all-but-impossible, the union of the thirteen states looked at the time. The friction be-

tween them was tremendous. New York imposed angry tariffs on Connecticut wood and on New Jersey butter. Massachusetts closed its ports to British shipping while Connecticut did the opposite, Boston boycotted Rhode Island grain, Philadelphia refused to accept New Jersey money. The money of many of the states was indeed worthless and the citizens had to be forced to accept it. New York massed troops on the Vermont frontier, and the army of Pennsylvania, acting against Connecticut settlers, committed the "Wyoming massacre" atrocities. The Congress of the League often had no quorum, it hardly ever had any money in its treasury, its borrowing power was exhausted, courts were broken up by armed mobs. When it was vitally necessary for the League's troops to reach their own arsenal in Massachusetts, so strong was the feeling for state sovereignty that Massachusetts refused to allow the League troops to enter its territory, even to put down a rebellion which Massachusetts also wanted put down. Washington wrote that he was more troubled and uneasy than ever he had been during the war of independence. Even Thomas Paine said that harmony was probably entirely impossible in America. "Made up as it is," he said, "of people from different nations, accustomed to different forms and habits of government, speaking different languages and more different in their modes of worship, it would appear that the union of such a people was impracticable."

And the Dean of Gloucester in England wrote—he was a liberal and an idealist, too, remember:

> As to the future grandeur of America and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchical, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived even by writers of romance. . . . a disunited people to the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths and principalities, according to natural boundaries. . .

On the very eve of the Federal Convention, no one believed a federal union was possible. In fact, the Convention had to wait ten days before there was a quorum. It was called only to reform the League. Nothing more was hoped. Yet within a hundred days, the proposal was formed into a plan; within two years the union became a fact. Those who were called in the newspapers "visionary young men" and laughed at, lived to see the United States a successful federal union.

Now if all this was possible then, why is it not equally possible to have a federal union of all the democracies now? It is no more than an extension of the American union system to half the world. Once again, the necessity for it is pressing; once again, the distress is acute; the ordinary people cry out for a real solution of their problems. I absolutely believe that if this new plan were explained to the world's ordinary people, it would be adopted at once—especially if it were presented reasonably fairly. There is not a single democracy that would stay out. It would be the American "Bill of Rights" extended to cover half the world. As to colonial possessions, it would ensure that the progress of the world's backward peoples would be within a great commonwealth dedicated to liberty and humanity. Thus they would be saved from enslavement to tribalisms old and new and from the disastrous separatisms which lead to their inclusion in war.

I mean *the world—not the present democratic nations only.* For this is not a hate-promoting alliance—or a balance of power. It invites *every nation on earth* to join the federal union; and all that is asked is that the minimum constitution be signed and the supreme sovereignty be recognized. Representation would not be by nations only, but by direct election according to population; two houses, as in the case of our House of Representatives and Senate. All the ordinary affairs of business would be conducted, within the union, not between nations but between individuals, just as now within this country. Passports would be issued by the united commonwealth. The police power of army and navy would be vested in the union. But language and local customs would remain, kings would continue to be kings within their ancient realms—their decorativeness undiminished—but all under the constitution of the union; just as there are governors in the separate states of the American union and varying state political arrangements within a total federal framework. And there would be plenty of room for diversity. Germany, for example, could join this union simply by returning to processes of law and liberty and the rights of man; the particular kind of government within Germany could be what the German people chose, subject to these fundamental human principles. And who would dare to say that any nation is done an injustice by being required to do as much as that? I would be ready to hazard a certainty that the people of Germany, left free to choose, would welcome this plan with open arms. It would be an admission to equal rights in every way, subject only to the reasonable and exactly similar rights of others. It would be the same with other nations which are not at present democracies. The moral power of a union like this would be so compelling that, within only a short space of time, every great nation on earth would want to be inside it.

The only war to worry about, then, would be civil war; and by adequate control of the armed forces and a careful disposition of them, civil war would also be impossible. Nor need it be feared that the new state of things would be static—it was not static in the United States and it is not static in this country now. One region after another has achieved some degree of temporary dominance and the same thing would be true in the world union—but under conditions of peaceful competition.

For myself, I have long believed that whether we wish it or not, we are moving towards a world civilization. Such a civilization will succeed this one after the earth has been drenched with blood, if it does not come in a better way. Why not plan it ourselves? Why not do what common sense dictates? And idealism demands? And religion requires?

I think there is no doubt about any of these three things. I have written of the first two. Let me end with the third. Long years ago, the prophet Isaiah, watching the havoc wrought by warring empires, frustrated in the hope of keeping his own little nation out of repeated disasters, came to the conclusion that God had no use for empires or for choices between them; that the sword must indeed be turned into the ploughshare but that this could only be done when men were all of one brotherhood, even to the ends of the earth. Every great prophet has seen the same vision, arrived at the same conclusion. Every great religion moves towards it. Poets have sung the hope of it; those who would tell the future see no other fulfillment for mankind.

What a thrilling possibility it is that even at this

hour, the way to achievement lies open before us! We could do it! If we will only dare! Some day, by some means, it must come! Why not soon? Why not pioneer it? We live in the most privileged nation under heaven; we have been fearing that we might have to redeem our privileges by shedding our blood; desperately trying to save the world from madness; or in default of it, watching civilization die while our faith and hope died with it; but we can save civilization without the shedding of blood; we can offer to the world a way of freedom, of justice, of progress; we can lead mankind to brotherhood. For this plan holds up a hope to the whole world that its life may be built upon righteousness and love.

I do not know what reception the plan will have; I only know what reception it ought to have and that is enough. If a thing is right and practical, a man should take his stand for it. Even though he be a voice in the wilderness crying, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord."

For the day must come, and it may be soon, when "the crooked shall be made straight and the rough places plain and all flesh shall see the salvation of God."

The Neutrality Question

SALMON O. LEVINSON

[Our readers will be interested in the following statement by Mr. S. O. Levinson, stalwart friend of UNITY and outstanding authority on international affairs, as published in a recent issue of the *United States News*. We would call especial attention to this remarkable affirmation:

> Legislative efforts to control armaments hardly rise to the dignity of halfway measures. Nations that are preparing for war before war comes are now allowed to buy *ad libitum. If it is wrong to sell armaments during a war, it is wrong to sell in preparation for the war.*

Pacifists would draw one conclusion from this statement, as Mr. Levinson draws another. But the fact, seldom recognized, and if recognized seldom noted, is basic to any true understanding of the whole armament question. The above quotation clarifies the issue like a stroke of lightning.—EDITOR.]

The basic principle of American foreign policy outside of the Monroe Doctrine is that the American people shall always be free to deal with future unknown contingencies, as they arise, in the interest of justice, liberty, and peace. That was the accepted view of the "irreconcilables" and the "isolationists" during the League of Nations fight. By reason of our being composed overwhelmingly of all the nations of Europe, that policy is wise.

Now as to neutrality! A neutral nation has heretofore always meant a nation that was not in a war that was being carried on by other nations. In other words, there were belligerent nations and neutral nations. Now under the guise of keeping us out of war, efforts have been made the past two or three years to convert the word "neutrality" into a completely changed meaning, definition, and interpretation. Why should international neutrality be substantially different in America from what it is in other civilized countries? And a neutral nation has always been free to sell to any and all belligerents.

Specifically as to the suggestions of Secretary of State Cordell Hull:

A. Generally speaking, I believe in his program of legislation designed to prevent all war. For the prevention of war is deeply imbedded in the hearts of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

B. In detail, I believe in the repeal of the present embargo on arms to belligerents. The real international question is as to contraband and under international law contraband includes wheat, bread, pork and beans, clothing, boots, and innumerable other things in addition to armaments. Hence, I think the effort to embargo armaments is largely emotional. If we can ship the other things needed for the use of a foreign army, which are all contraband under international law, the other nations can furnish armaments and then we will have accomplished exactly nothing.

(2) I believe in prohibition of the entry of American ships into combat areas. That is a mere matter of prudence, safety, and common sense.

(3) The same would apply to (3), being restrictition of travel by Americans in combat area. Why court unnecessary danger?

(4) Requiring transfer to belligerent purchasers of title to goods before shipping is merely a protective move on the part of the seller and the citizens of this country, and wholly unobjectionable.

(5) I favor prohibition of loans and credits to belligerents, a most natural thing after the way our fingers were burned in the last war.

(6) I am not clear whether I understand Secretary Hull's proposal to regulate solicitation of funds. But if I do, I am against it. Our people are freemen in this country, to do as they please so long as they do not violate our laws or the rights of others. They can even enlist on either side of a strictly European war. Such is our full measure of liberty!

(7) I favor continuance of National Munitions Control to restrain and prevent abuse.

I would add that most of these legislative efforts to control armaments hardly rise to the dignity of halfway measures. Nations that are preparing for war before war comes are now allowed to buy *ad libitum.* If it is wrong to sell armaments during a war, it is wrong to sell in preparation for the war. America cannot be deaf, dumb and blind to all that goes on in this world, a world in which God is defied and force deified. We never have been before. There are two ways of getting into war: One is by being too brash, and the other is by being too cowardly. My country should be neither.

Jungle Blood

Black
panthers
of old fears
tear at the world's
throat.

LLOYD FRANK MERRELL

Academic Freedom

JEROME DAVIS

Academic freedom is the lifeblood of democracy. Without it democratic institutions are transmuted into autocracies. Freedom of speech, of press, and of association are an inherent right of the human mind. They are as inalienable a part of the human heritage as life itself. The processes of society must also be free. Victims of race prejudice, mental starvation, and economic exploitation do not have freedom. Freedom is possible only in soil which is favorable to happiness, justice, and unhampered search for truth. The Fascist-Nazi soil is deadly to freedom. There thought is regimented, truth is suppressed, the press is controlled, and education itself has become a tool of propaganda. In Germany 1,600 professors and teachers have been dismissed. Naturally education is in a state of coma.

Even in the United States the attacks on academic freedom are increasing. From 1916 to 1935, 322 cases were brought to the attention of the American Association of University Professors, and the National Academic Freedom Committee of the American Federation of Teachers is constantly engaged in defending teachers who have been unjustly dismissed.

Yet without academic freedom, teaching becomes a mask for regimentation. In the Japanese schools the teachers told me that their only freedom was in unexpressed thoughts. Is it surprising that students in Japan now tend to have copy-book minds and that the rape of China is sold to the public by the military machine as "justice and honor"?

Without academic freedom, educational institutions become propaganda machines. As freedom is throttled, education is stifled. In America, particularly where trustees are often influenced by the financial interests and where public school boards may be reactionary, we must be on our guard against the warping effects of special privilege. Any attack from the public or the graduates of an institution on freedom of teaching or freedom of action on the part of the teacher should be resisted as a threat to the very life of America itself. To the extent that any institution does not allow the teacher full freedom to discuss such questions as unemployment, trade unions, or capitalism, education is being propagandized.

As teachers we must beware of being mere "theorists" falling victims to the rationalizations of administrators who charge the fearless teacher with being unscientific when they really mean he is too effective in portraying uncomfortable truth.

Without academic freedom, the pupil is penalized. Many of the greatest issues confronting mankind have not yet been decided. The student should learn that the pocketbook nerve in our modern society is highly sensitive. Touch a man's pocketbook and one gets instantaneous response. A corollary of this is that the human animal resists new habit patterns of thought, especially when they interfere with vested interest. There are few pains more severe than the pain of a new idea. Parcel post was fought by most of the wealthy class. It was called "Communism." People speak of a new idea as "upsetting" or "dangerous." What they really mean is that their habit patterns are disturbed. The noblest ideas are often the most unpopular and "dangerous." Intelligent controversy with the truth as the goal sharpens intellect and makes the mind grow. Free search for truth is just as important as sunlight and air to the organism. Without it we eventually get mental stagnation, dangerous rationalizations, and intellectual paralysis.

Without academic freedom society is penalized. To crush opposing points of view means inevitably to crush the truth in some measure. A characteristic of all governments and all societies is that they tend to think that their particular beliefs and patterns of social organization are final. All history teaches the contrary. No present organization of society can be wholly right. Indeed, the presumption is that it may be in some measure wrong. Therefore, if freedom is denied, the right to create a better society is impaired.

If there is no freedom in the schools, there cannot be freedom in society. The teacher must have liberty to know, to utter, to argue freely. To silence the instructor is to rob posterity, the oncoming generation, indeed all of the human race. If the opinion expressed is right, society is denied the freedom of choosing truth from error. If the expressed idea is wrong, society loses again because it is prohibited from that clearer vision of truth and justice which comes from the clash of one contrary opinion against another. In such a process truth is always sharpened and clarified. Suppression postpones the free emergence of the truth. Denial of the right to freely discuss controversial issues sets the brakes on social progress. In the end censorship and suppression usually bring about war and social explosion. He who would rob his fellow citizens of a new idea is the greatest enemy to human freedom and liberty. Free discussion promoting intelligence, quickening thought, acts as a prophylaxis against nearly every one of the social diseases threatening mankind.

Obviously, freedom has its dangers, but so does every great heritage of progress. Democracy itself is fraught with dangers. How comfortable autocracy and monarchy seem to those who benefit from its favors! One of the advantages of freedom is that time can be trusted to cure its evils. We should remember the dissenting opinion of Justices Holmes and Brandeis who said:

> If in the long run the beliefs expressed in proletarian dictatorship are destined to be accepted by the dominant forces of the community, the only meaning of free speech is that they should be given their chance and have their way. . . . Serious injury cannot alone justify suppression of free speech and assembly. Men feared witches and burned women. It is the function of speech to free men from the bondage of irrational fear.

As teachers we must insist that the highest patriotism, the greatest democracy, demands freedom of speech, of press, and of association. Within the American Federation of Teachers, locals should have the right to differ on policies, programs, and attitudes. No one local should be able to say, "Thou shalt not pass such a resolution." We should, of course, take into account the feelings of others, but we must recognize the freedom of the group as well as the individual. We cannot function as a democratic organization if we do not allow members to belong to any race, to hold to any religious faith, and to be members of any political party. All over the United States individuals and groups are being attacked because they have dared to express or write the truth as they saw it. The American Federation of Teachers will fight with all its power to protect

this precious heritage of liberty. For without freedom in the lives of teachers, students, and organized groups, no school can really be said to exist at all.

The real traitors to our country are not those who express the truth honestly and courageously as they see it, but rather the individuals masquerading under the guise of patriotism or even a verbiage of scientific jargon who would throttle and prevent the teacher or anyone else in American life from expressing his true beliefs.

The Study Table

A German Rebel

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A GERMAN REBEL. *By Toni Sender. New York: The Vanguard Press.* $3.00.

Your present reviewer, with long experience in book discussions, usually approaches with awe the task of reviewing a book of some importance on the subject matter of which he has but superficial knowledge. However, he is happy in reviewing this book in the sense of his own European background and education, together with the fact that he had the privilege of entertaining the brilliant authoress in his own home and experiencing personally the effect of her dynamic personality, broad general culture, and idealistic conception of life. This discussion of Toni Sender, which she calls *The Autobiography of a German Rebel,* has a different approach to most of the books which are coming from the press with so much rapidity in these days anent the European chaos.

From her earliest days to maturity, she was a rebel against the *status quo* in the best possible sense of the term "rebel." Your reviewer belongs to the species, rapidly growing extinct, of the "liberal" as opposed to the "extremist" in either Fascist or Communist camps, and can therefore review this book from the humanitarian rather than from the partisan point of view, and cordially endorses the sentiment herein quoted, which provides, as it were, a keynote of the story itself as well as of the authoress' life:

> If, however, you are not only a strong individualist but also a human being feeling keenly the desire to be a member of a community, realizing that the well-being of the individual and that of the community are interdependent, then you would feel selfish if you rejected your obligation toward society. Many an individualist also wants a better world. He cannot create it by himself—and he cannot for any length of time live a really full life at the expense of others. It certainly is one of the greatest arts in life to find the synthesis of a strong individualism and an active participation in the struggle to create a better world.

The book traces the whole story of the transition of Germany from a land of culture and charm to the present-day Reich which is little short of barbarism, but in the doing of it, it touches many sore points of European and even of American diplomacy. There is little doubt that the autobiographer is merely restating what most thinking men and women feel today when she says:

> I had a long discussion with the two official British delegates, Margaret Bondfield (in later years the Minister of Labor in the MacDonald cabinet) and Marion Philipps, the very intelligent leader of the women's trade-union movement in Great Britain. They insisted that Britain had gone to war in order to defend little Belgium, whose neutrality had been violated by the Germans. Although I had protested most vigorously against this violation, I doubted the generosity of a British government which had tolerated so many injustices in the world, and which itself had committed some of them. It seemed to me more probable that Britain had entered the war for the sake of her own interests. Since then, developments have, unfortunately, proved me right.

For thirteen years, as a comparatively young woman, Toni Sender sat in the Reichstag through the many vicissitudes which that body underwent during the period in the transition from autocracy to republic and back to whatever we may call the present German régime. An interesting personal side light is explained through the following words:

> In later years I have often been asked, especially in the United States, "What did you do to be elected to the Reichstag?" I could only answer, "Nothing at all." I did not ask for it. It was quite natural that Robert and I should be candidates after our years of devotion and leadership, and my position was not disputed. But the office of deputy never seemed to me something highly desirable. The only thing I wanted was a chance to do useful work for the community, for the masses and the nation. Not that I was without ambition, but the accent was more on the achievement than on a position of honor.

The power of German industrialists and their part in the bringing about of the present chaos is also well known to most students of contemporary history, but the personal knowledge of the sinister influences of Stinnes, et al, in their early dealings with Hitler when merely a demagogue, as he still is in power, lessens whatever sympathy one may feel for the so-called "upper classes" in the Germany of today. Perhaps one of the most important paragraphs in the book is that which deals in restrained fashion with the indictment of the Allies' conduct following the War, which no doubt contributed to, if it did not actually stimulate, the cause of Hitler and his contemporaries. The extraordinary thing about the reactions to the manifestly unjust Versailles Treaty is that before Hitler inaugurated his régime of barbarism and cruelty, the intelligentsia of the whole world were turning with sympathy toward Germany and not only cherished but were ready to activate and motivate redress of the wrongs of this infamous Treaty. The stupidity of German diplomacy, which is characteristic throughout its whole history, is here exemplified to the nth degree.

When we attempt to estimate the apparent failure of German Socialism during the War and in the post-war period, we need something of the intelligent understanding which this book affords us of the machinations of the industrialists. The brief paragraph here quoted exemplifies something of their dealings:

> The final episode in the struggle for the Ruhr once again made clear who were the true patriots among the people. The French general, Degoutte, had not attempted to negotiate with the German government for the cessation of the policy of passive resistance. His ridiculous pretext was that the government would not cease its aid to the unemployed of the Ruhr. As if one could simply abandon tens of thousands to naked misery! Degoutte turned to the industrialists, Stinnes, Voegler, Kloeckner, and Otto Wolff—all men with whom Adolf Hitler later was to be on the best of terms. The German government and its people first learned from Paris dispatches that in these direct negotiations Hugo Stinnes had sought the coöperation of the French generals to force the German

miners to accept a working day of ten hours above ground with eight and one-half hours for underground work.

For a long period of time, Americans especially seemed to feel that Dr. Hjalmar Schacht was only half-heartedly a member of the Nazi party and was not in complete sympathy with its aims and its conduct. It may still be true that he is not an advocate of its cruelties and extremities, but Toni Sender throws a new light upon his character, his weakness, and apparent willingness to subordinate his principles to expediency.

Among the many extraordinary experiences of Toni Sender, perhaps one of the most interesting is the story of her interview with our own American industrialist, Judge Gary. If it is possible to conjure up through one's imagination two individuals more utterly opposed in everything which goes to make up manhood or womanhood, one could not dream of a mythical pair more unlike than these two real persons, and it is a testimony to Toni Sender's vibrant and pleasant personality that the austere Judge Gary even condescended to a discussion of personal matters with her.

> I felt I had imposed long enough on Judge Gary's time and prepared to end the visit. Suddenly he asked me: "Will you permit me a last, very personal question? You may answer it only if you care to do so." I encouraged him to go on. "Why," he asked, "didn't a woman like you marry?"
>
> I was indeed embarrassed for a moment. But I decided that since our conversation had been conducted in full frankness on both sides, I could satisfy the old gentleman's curiosity on this point also.
>
> "I think, Judge Gary, that we have to make up our minds as to the main task to which we want to devote our lives. Very early I felt the urge to try to give my full service to the cause of freedom and social justice, to help bring about a better existence, materially and culturally, for the underprivileged. We live in a revolutionary period. Family ties could eventually prevent one from showing all the courage and unselfishness that a great cause requires—especially in the case of a young woman. And since the earliest days of my childhood I have been guided by the poet's words: 'Nicht halb zu tun ist edler Geister Art' (To do nothing halfway is the way of noble minds)."

Your reviewer wishes it were possible to quote the whole concluding chapter. Toni Sender is now an exile preparing for American citizenship; and among all the many testimonies to the glory and potentiality of this democracy that have been written by its native sons and daughters, there are few to approach in beauty and in charm the wholly clear-sighted and impartial statement of the potentialities of America of this contribution of a daughter of Germany who has suffered so much. To use her own words,

> Hitler has deprived me of my citizenship and property. It was a punishment for my love of Liberty. I was a woman without a country until I came to the United States. Here love of freedom is an asset and not a liability. Bold and new ideas are permitted—here it is still worth while to place your modest capacity at the disposal of the common good. Liberty is to me not only an indispensable element of life, but also an obligation—an obligation toward the community that grants me the privilege of becoming one of its members. I thank you, America, for accepting me and giving me an opportunity to start a new chapter of my life, a chapter that I will devote to the cultivation of the ideals for which the best of mankind has fought and died.

It is significant that, although Toni Sender is a Jewess, she makes very few references to that fact in her autobiography. Of course her major crime against Germany was not the fact that she was a rebel according to the Hitler philosophy, but the fact that she was a non-Aryan. There is, however, a significance in her reticent and brief references to the fact of her being a Jewess. The authoress represents in the best possible fashion the type of internationalism of which the Jews are accused and of which their noblest sons and daughters are willing to plead guilty. A love of country which never descends into Chauvinism, and which always holds aloft as an ideal the concept of good citizenship minus hatred of other national groups, is not only the concept of the Jew but is a part of his heritage and of his priceless contribution to the laying of the foundation stone of a new social order, not of a homogenous world but of a world in which there shall always be separate entities with tolerance each for the other so that they may live in amity, comity, and peace.

In the interim, Toni Sender represents the type of world thinker through which Hitler and his cohorts are enriching our own democracy. She is only one of many, but she typifies them. The noblest brains of Germany are being exiled and all the countries of the world are being enriched thereby. One reads Toni Sender's autobiography with a sense of gratitude and with the sentiment uppermost in one's mind of a sense of deep sympathy for the German people in the irreparable loss which this reign of barbarism is inflicting upon their nation.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM

The Method of Experience

THE THEOLOGICAL METHOD OF JESUS. *By William Wallace Fenn. 91 pp. Boston: Beacon Press. $1.50.*

The publication of this series of lectures, first delivered at the Harvard Summer School in 1905, will be welcomed by all the students and friends of the late Dean Fenn, not to speak of the wider circle of liberals who have looked upon him as the living embodiment of religious liberalism in its character of sympathetic comprehensiveness and fearless independence of judgment.

Although there have perhaps been more books published on Jesus than on any other single figure in history, a comparatively small number of these books have been devoted to the question of Jesus' method which Dean Fenn raises here. Most of the investigations have sought to elucidate the meaning, the significance, or the sources of Jesus' teaching, and have disclosed the methodology of the authors rather than of Jesus.

One hears repeated rather frequently these days the charge that liberal New Testament criticism of the past century has been little more than a variety of spiritual ventriloquism. This charge was perhaps most succinctly and wittily stated by Father Tyrrell when he said: "The Liberal Protestant looks down into a deep well, sees his own reflection, and calls it Jesus." Deussen's work on *Die Philosophie der Bible* (1919) may be taken at random as an illustration of this sort of narcissism. He found the teaching of Jesus to be the beginning of Kantianism.

Dean Fenn's treatment of Jesus' teaching and method as set forth in this volume is certainly exempt from this charge of ventriloquism. He does not try to explain away those aspects of Jesus' teaching which do not fit into the liberal world view. Recognition is given to the fact that Jesus was not a modern Liberal, especially in his views concerning the Messiahship, the last things, the exorcism of evil spirits, and the divine authority of the Jewish scriptures. Nor does

Dean Fenn claim, with regard to the "theological method" of Jesus, "either that he invariably reasons according to it or that he ever consciously formulated it."

What was this method? It did not appeal to a special form of revelation, though it did presuppose a communion with God which made Jesus' hearers say that he spoke as one having authority and not as the scribes; that is, it was a method open to all. "Through his communion with God, his eyes were opened to divine meanings in common things. . . The materials of his thought seem to have been derived from his experience with nature and with man." This appeal of Jesus to everyday experience with nature and man is abundantly illustrated in the parables: here spoke the keen observer of nature and its processes, of man and his ways. The Gospels abound in references to the things which cannot be dated, to common experience: vineyards, fig trees, plowing, sowing, harvesting, buying, selling, lending, children, wayward sheep, and ne'er-do-wells. "All these matters of daily observation and experience tell the secrets of the Kingdom of God, and from them Jesus draws his thought and his teaching. While he is thus in the way of reason, truth takes form in his mind, not while he is in ecstatic raptures."

But Jesus' method not only took ordinary experience into account. It also interpreted nature and human life in accordance with a logical principle. Dean Fenn characterizes this principle as the "a fortiori method of argument." The school of Hillel and also of Ishmael had for long used a similar method for the interpretation of Scripture, the rule of Light and Heavy. This rule set forth the idea that if a certain restriction holds with regard to an instance of slight importance, it holds all the more in a case of great importance. If it is allowable, for example, to do a certain thing for an animal on a feast or holy day, it is allowable to do the same thing for a man. The rabbis applied this principle to the words of Scripture, but Jesus applied it to the ways of nature and of men. If God clothes the grass, shall He not much more clothe you? If man ought to deal thus with man, all the more will God do so. If a shepherd seeks a sheep that is lost until he find it, how much more faithful is God than a human shepherd, and how much more is a man than a sheep. As God deals with man in nature, so He deals also with the soul of man. "If his minor gifts of sunshine and shower are bestowed impartially upon the evil and the good, the just and the unjust, is not His mercy much more over the soul of man?" Jesus thus applied the a fortiori argument to inner experience as well as outer experience. He argued from the deepest feelings of his own soul, feelings of love and forgiveness, up to God from whom they proceed and of whom they bear witness. Hence, both from nature and from man come just, though insufficient, revelations of the nature and operations of God.

A great wealth of illustrative material is presented to substantiate the claim that Jesus' theological method included this simple, logical, a fortiori type of argument. Dean Fenn pondered long and deeply over the parables and the sayings of Jesus, and almost every page of this little book sheds some new insight upon them. The few pages on the parable of the prodigal son will seem to some readers not only to possess this freshness of insight, but also to reflect the very quintessence of Dean Fenn's spirit as well.

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS.

Meaningful Worship

LET US PRAY. *By Robert French Leavens. Published by the Eucalyptus Press, Mills College, California.*

This little volume of less than fifty pages is a book of exquisite beauty—exquisite in thought, and feeling, and literary expression. It represents the precious deposit of the author's many "years of thought and effort toward making private devotion and common worship meaningful." In a Foreword, Mr. Leavens, Chaplain of Mills College and a Unitarian clergyman of high repute, describes with fine precision his philosophy and practice of prayer, and in his finely wrought pages presents one of the most important and lovely contributions to the literature of prayer in our day.

The thirty-five separate prayers, which follow this introduction, most of them only a page long, are so many illustrations of his theme. As devotional expressions of the religious spirit, I regard these prayers as worthy of a place beside the great prayers of all time. There is no way of making plain their profound emotion and deep spiritual insight, combined with uttermost simplicity, except by direct quotation. Here is an invocation (in part):

Holy and beautiful the custom
Which brings us together,
In the presence of the Most High,
to face our ideals,
to remember our loved ones in absence,
to give thanks,
to make confession,
to offer forgiveness,
to be enlightened,
and to be strengthened.
Through this quiet hour
Breathes the worship of ages,
The cathedral music of history. . . .

Note this gem of a prayer:

O Thou in whom we live and move and have our being,
Who hast compassed us about
With a great cloud of witnesses,
The true-hearted and the brave,
The wise and the saintly,
More worthily of such high company we would live:
May we run with patience
The course that is set before us,
Faithful to our highest purposes,
And sure of thy sustaining strength.

I have used these prayers in my religious services, and shall continue to use them. They touch the mind and lift the soul. Before such outpouring of the spirit, the controversies of theism and humanism become trivial. Mr. Leavens is best known as the compiler and editor of *Great Companions,* a widely-used collection of extra-Biblical readings. In this little book of original prayers, he has again placed us immeasurably in his debt.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Half a Loaf. . .

I read how mobs desired to throng
The church where could be seen,
At worship with the President,
The British King and Queen.

Why such a crowd on this one day
To fill the sacred spot?—
When *every* Sunday *God* is there—
Or maybe He is not.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE.

Correspondence

Protest

Editor of UNITY:

As a pacifist, I *abhor* the article which Mr. Levinson has in the June 5th issue of UNITY. It seems to me to be on a level with "war agitation." The last paragraph is pernicious. . . .

A. G.

New York, N. Y.

Henry Frick, Not Henry Flagler

Editor of UNITY:

I note in your issue of May 15 that you quote a story from my *Fighting Years* as coming from Henry Flagler. This is an extraordinary slip, because it is clearly attributed in my book to Henry C. Frick, and yet throughout the article all instances are attributed by your writer to Mr. Flagler. I trust that you will feel like correcting this injustice.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD.

Thomaston, Connecticut.

[*Note:* Mr. Villard is quite right—this is "an extraordinary slip." It is understandable, perhaps, as one of those strange slips of memory which occasionally catch us all, but inexcusable in any well-edited magazine. We are grateful to Mr. Villard for bringing this matter to our attention, and thus enabling us to correct this injustice.—*Editor.*]

A Compensationist in This Modern Age

Editor of UNITY:

I am what you would call a compensationist, in that I believe that what you do here you get paid for here, and you may also get trimmed after you pass on, only nobody is just exactly certain about that.

If I had the opportunity to steal a dollar, nothing on earth could induce me to do it, because I believe if I did, I would get two dollars' worth of trouble out of it. I think if we could make people believe that, we would have a better world. The growing wickedness of today is in my opinion due to a variety of causes.

First, I think the minister, the man we should look upon as our sheet anchor, the one who should show us how to lead a correct life, and influence us to do it, is as a class losing his grip, first because he preaches only what he is told to preach; secondly, because he is turning the pulpit into a lecture platform; and thirdly because he is beginning to like chasing the fleshpots as well as anyone else.

We have the vulgar, disgusting pictures of so-called "socialites," published by the newspapers in their society editions, in postures and attitudes that a woman of the streets would not allow, and that a few years ago would have sent the editor to jail for publishing obscene literature, and just where he should be sent now. We have the woman who sets the example to her children, (if she has not been smart enough to avoid having any), of painting her face, her lips, and finger nails, dyeing her hair, smoking and drinking in public places, and gambling at bridge.

We sell our automobiles to anybody who has the price, irrespective of whether they are cranks, Sadists, or human hogs; and they run over and murder people, who are unfortunate enough to be born without wings, and the manufacturer does not care enough to lend his influence to promote legislation that will stop it. In the meantime, flaming youth goes along developing its own ideas, which are becoming looser and broader each day. I thank God that I am able to believe in Him without the help of any smirking preacher, and that I am a compensationist which makes me try to hoe a straight row.

Detroit, Michigan.

PAUL TURNER.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 146)

Hull can be firmly trusted to get us in. Hardly a single step in the processes that pushed the United States into war in 1917 is left out. The President is allowed to choose the time and occasion when we leap the precipice. The munitions traffic would get a gigantic boost by furnishing the war materials for a European war, as was done before. The whole economy of the country would be tied in with war profits so that the pull, as before, would be practically irresistible to follow profits into war. The famous Page cablegram before the war, which proclaimed that the only way to save the loans and business profits was to get into war, made clear that pull. A group of twenty-one United States senators, headed by Senator Nye, has pointed out clearly the position that the Hull "neutrality" efforts would put the country into:

> The United States can ill afford to place itself in the unbecoming light of a nation persisting in the talk of detesting war while at the same time scheming to get profit from the wars of other nations, or, while urging peace upon other nations, furnishing the instrumentalities and munitions by which they may carry forward war.
>
> The United States can well afford to get along without such profit as might be available from other people's wars.
>
> To maintain the arms embargo is in no sense a restriction or limitation upon any constitutional power belonging to the Executive.
>
> Putting munitions on a cash-and-carry basis is a subterfuge. Far more honest would be an open alliance with Great Britain or Japan or France or Russia than an act which would aid in time of war only that nation or those nations in control of the sea.
>
> There can be no compromise with any scheme which would destroy the safeguard which is the arms embargo, or with any scheme that would lessen the ability of our own country to stay out of war.

Zion's Herald.

Kagawa Visits Gandhi

"Declare Heresies and Be Shot," Gandhi Advises

On the occasion of his recent visit to India to attend the Madras missionary conference, Toyohiko Kagawa, the renowned Japanese Christian exponent of coöperatives, paid a short visit to Gandhi. The editor of *Harijan,* Gandhi's paper, says that Kagawa "does not appear to have worked out his faith to its extreme logical conclusion. I may be mistaken, but it is my conviction that having cut himself adrift from his people in early life, he lacks the capacity to antagonize them on large issues out of the depth of love."

"Why has not pacifism made much headway in Japan?" we asked him. "Look at the mobilization law," he said. "You cannot speak, you cannot write what you please. Everyone under fifty has to enlist himself." "But," said I, "if you find thousands of men willing to throw themselves into the jaws of death for war, why can't you find thousands willing to go to death for their convictions for peace?" He smiled incredulously. . . .

"I am rather a heretic in Japan," said Dr. Kagawa. "Rather than express my views, I would like to learn from you what you would do if you were in my position."

"It would be presumptuous for me to express my views," said Gandhiji.

"No, I would like very much to know what you would do."

"I would declare my heresies and be shot. I would put the coöperatives and all your work in one scale, and put the honor of your nation in the other, and if you found that the honor was being sold, I should ask you to declare your views against Japan and in so doing make Japan live through your death. But, for this, inner conviction is necessary. I do not know that I should be able to do all that I have said if I were in your position, but I must give you my opinion since you have asked for it."

"The conviction is there. But friends have been asking me to desist."

"Well, don't listen to friends when the Friend inside you says, 'Do this.' And friends, however good, can sometimes well deceive us. They cannot argue otherwise. They would ask you to *live* and do your work. The same appeal was made to me when I took the decision to go to jail. But I did not listen to friends with the result that I found the glow of freedom when I was confined within the four solid walls of prison. I was inside a dark cell, but I felt that I could see everything from within those walls, and nothing from outside."

Dr. Kagawa seemed to shrink from continuing this discussion. There was indeed no room for it.